

REMARKS

Claims 3, 4, 6, and 23-25 are now pending in the application. Minor amendments have been made to the specification to simply overcome the objections to the specification and rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Support for these modifications can be found in paragraphs [0025] and [0026] and in Figures 1 – 3. Claims 3, 4 and 23 have been amended to more clearly define the claimed subject matter. The basis for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings. The preceding amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

Claims 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Further, the Examiner states that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 24 recites that “said blade is secured relative to said handle in each of a lengthwise direction of said blade, a widthwise direction of said blade, and a depthwise direction of said blade by a positive engagement of said blade with one or more of said handle and said blade mounting screw.” The amendments to paragraphs [0025] and

[0026] are supported by Figures 1 – 3. Written description support for this claim can be found in amended paragraphs [0025] and [0026].

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Examiner expresses concern that three positions are being claimed, although only two are disclosed. As described above, three positions (lengthwise, depthwise, and widthwise) are claimed and for which support can be found in the specification and Figures, as discussed above with regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. These positions refer to a constructive Cartesian coordinate system placed on the blade, not to blade attachment positions. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 24 is in conformance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In light of the foregoing Claim 24 discussion, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 25 which depends from Claim 24 is not indefinite for at least the same reasons. Therefore, dependent Claim 25 should be in condition for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of Claims 24 and 25.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Davey (U.S. Pat. No. 2,017,895). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

at an uncomfortable angle. Therefore, currently amended Claim 23 should be in condition for allowance. Support for this amendment can be found in Figures 1 – 3. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 4, 6, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davey (U.S. Pat. No. 2,017,895) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter, AAPA). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Currently amended, Independent Claim 3 calls for a hand saw comprising “a handle including a hand grip portion and first and second blade mounting portions...and a blade adapted to be removably mounted to either of said first and second blade mounting portions...” Claim 3 further recites “...said first and second blade mounting portions each include a screw boss for receiving a blade mounting screw therein...” and “...a key adapted to be received in an end slot in said blade to secure said blade in both lengthwise and widthwise directions of said blade.”

Currently amended, independent Claim 4 recites “a handle including a hand grip portion and first and second blade mounting portions...each of said first and second blade mounting portions including a screw boss...” Claim 4 further calls for the hand saw to include “...a blade removably mounted to one of said first and second blade mounting portions; and a blade mounting screw removably engaged with said screw boss of said one of said first and second blade mounting portions so as to couple said blade to said handle...” where both mounting portions “include a key adapted to be received in an end slot in said blade to secure said blade in both lengthwise and widthwise directions of said blade.”

The Davey reference appears to teach a hand saw 10 comprising a handle 12, a hand grip portion 20, first and second blade mounting portions 24, 27 and a blade 11, which can be mounted to either of the first or second blade mounting portions 24, 27. Further, Davey discloses a T-headed stud 24 for maintaining the blade and a pin 27 protruding from a shank 19 for engaging the blade. The Examiner acknowledges that Davey fails to disclose that the blade mounting portions each include a screw boss or a screw.

Davey also fails to disclose a key portion to be received in the end slot of the blade which secures the blade to the handle in both lengthwise and widthwise directions of the blade. The Davey disclosure relies on the widthwise movement of the blade 11 to lock into position behind the tongue 28. However, widthwise cutting forces may cause the blade 11 to remove itself from position behind the tongue 28. A loose blade could then cause harm to the user. Replacing the members (27 or 24) with a fastener and boss according to AAPA would not obviate this problem. Therefore, Claims 3 and 4 should be in condition for allowance.

Claims 6, 24 and 25 depend from one of Claims 3 and 4 and, therefore, for at least the reasons stated above with respect to Claims 3 and 4, should also be patentable.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5-11-07

By: Ryan W. Massey
Ryan W. Massey, Reg. No. 38,543

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

RWM/akc